1	David R. Welch (SBN 251693) D R WELCH ATTORNEYS AT LAW 500 South Grand Avenue, 18th Floor Los Angeles California 90071 Telephone: (213) 596-9008 Email: litigation@drwelchlaw.com	
2	Los Angeles California 90071	
3	Email: <u>litigation@drwelchlaw.com</u>	
4	Attorneys for Plaintiff Quonset Partners, LLC	
5	30 2	
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10	OHONGET DADTNEDG LLC	LC N 5-2022 CV 00/72 ICD VV
11	QUONSET PARTNERS, LLC, a California Limited Liability	Case No.: 5:2022-CV-00672-JGB-KKx
12	Company,	PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF NON-
13	PLAINTIFF,	OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S
14	V.	MOTION TO DISMISS AND REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO AMEND
15	City of Coachella, a Municipal	REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO AMEND
16	Corporation, and DOES 1 Through 100, Inclusive	Date: February 27, 2023
17	DEFENDANTS.	Time: 9:00 a.m. Ctrm: 1
18	DEFENDANTS.	
19		Action Filed: April 20, 2022
20		
21		_
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
_		

I. STATEMENT OF NON-OPPOSITION

Quonset Partners, LLC submits this statement of non-opposition on the grounds that discovery is continuing and without discovery, Plaintiff is unable to oppose Defendant's motion.

II. THE COURT SHOULD PLAINTIFF LEAVE TO AMEND

The 9th Circuit will review five factors in assessing whether a district court abused its discretion in dismissing a complaint without leave to amend: "bad faith, undue delay, prejudice to the opposing party, futility of amendment, and whether the plaintiff has previously amended the complaint." *United States v. Corinthian Colleges*, 655 F.3d 984, 995 (9th Cir.2011) Here, taking all five factors as whole, weights in favor of granting Plaintiff leave to amend.

The Court should not find evidence of bad faith. The following conspiracy which is alleged in the Complaint takes place clandestinely. The Plaintiffs are aware of the effects of the Conspiracy, to deprive Plaintiff of its property and rights to use certain property. Nonetheless, because of the clandestine nature of the allegations, Plaintiff necessitates the discovery process to identify those responsible and providing leave to amend will provide Plaintiff the necessary time to fully identify the characters in the underlying conspiracy. Additionally, there is no undue delay or prejudice to the City if Plaintiff is granted leave to amend. City is not deprived of the use of any property or right to act. Allowing Plaintiff's the opportunity to amend the complaint to include additional discoverable facts does nothing to prejudice Defendant City. this Court's discretion to deny leave to amend is "particularly broad" even where a plaintiff has filed an amended complaint. *Miller v. Yokohama Tire Corp.*, 358 F.3d 616, 622 (9th Cir.2004) Citing *Eminence Capital LLC v. Aspeon, Inc.*, 316 F.3d 1048,

1052 (9th Cir.2003) (holding that dismissal without leave to amend is improper unless the complaint could not be saved by any amendment). Here, the City's allegations of Conspiracy can be amended to overcome the defects alleged by the Defendant City. Specifically, the City can demonstrate the others involved in the conspiracy, via public records request and the coordinate with the City and the new owner of the Property, the former lender to Plaintiff. Additionally, Plaintiff may be able to provide witnesses who were former City employees who were aware of the conspiracy. Because facts may be added, after sufficient discovery is conducted by Plaintiff, leave to amend should be granted.

III. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Court should GRANT Plaintiff leave to amend its Complaint.

DRWELCH ATTORNEYS AT LAW